

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated August 15, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 16 and 28-30 were allowed, claims 1, 4, 21, 23 and 26 were rejected and claims 5, 6, 24 and 25 were objected, but would be considered allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 21 are amended. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1, 4-6, 16, 21 and 22-30 are in condition for allowance.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during telephone interviews on September 13, 2006 and September 27, 2006 of which are documented in Examiner Interview Summaries dated September 15, 2006 and September 29, 2006. The following discussion addresses topics that were discussed in these interviews as related to the claim rejections in the latest office action.

II. Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 21, 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al. (U.S. 5,880,908). Of these claims, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended.

According to the MPEP §2143, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 21 are in condition for allowance as including features not disclosed in the cited reference.

For example Shiraishi et al. fails to teach or suggest "at least one reservoir formed in the slider body and extending from the mounting surface towards the bearing surface" and "the mounting surface and the at least one reservoir configured to receive an adhesive deposit" as claimed in claim 1. Shiraishi et al. also fails to teach or suggest "at least one reservoir formed in

the slider body and extending from the mounting surface to a surface opposing the mounting surface” as claimed in claim 21. Instead, Shiraishi et al. discloses a partition pattern that is deposited on a flexure that partitions sections for receiving adhesive. See col. 4, lines 32- 65. Each partitioned section is provided such that adhesive supplied to the respective sections do not mix with each other. See col. 5, lines 1-8.

It is respectfully pointed out that a partition pattern that adds material to a surface of a flexure to hold adhesive is not equivalent to the features claimed in claims 1 and 21. Not only are the features of claims 1 and 21 structurally different from that which is disclosed in Shiraishi et al. (as discussed above), but Shiraishi et al. also teaches away from such claim features. In one aspect, the partition pattern as noted in col. 5, lines 1-8 is to hold adhesive in particular sections. The at least one reservoir of claim 1 and 21 is not to limit adhesive to any particular section of the slider, but to allow it to couple to more material of a slider and therefore provide a more resilient connection to a gimbal as indicated in the Specification on page 6, lines 1-6 . In another aspect, a partition pattern that adds material to a surface of a component would change the shape of that component. Such a change in shape of a slider causes the slider to perform improperly as indicated in the Specification on page 1, line 27 to page 2, line 9.

During the Examiner Interview, *In re Japikse* was generally discussed and introduced to demonstrate that a “rearrangement of parts” in a prior art reference does not make a claim patentable. However, features claimed in claims 1 and 21 are simply not found in the Shiraishi et al and therefore no “rearrangement of parts” is possible. Nowhere does Shiraishi et al. disclose a reservoir formed in a slider body, let alone such a reservoir and a mounting surface configured to receive an adhesive deposit.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 21 are in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 4, 23 and 26 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their dependency.

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to deposit account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne R. Taveggia/
Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jme